

***Remarks***

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-20 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 7, 8, 14 and 16 being the independent claims.

***Interview Summary***

The courtesy extended by Examiner Bates in the telephone interview of March 29 is noted with appreciation. During the interview, the portions of the Abecassis reference cited by the Examiner were discussed. The Examiner asserted that Abecassis discloses a broadcast operation from a server to a multimedia device, where the playlist is selected by the server based on a generalized musical preference expressed by the user. It was agreed, however, that the Abecassis reference does not appear to disclose or suggest interactive selection of clips at a multimedia device using a menu generated at the server. Further, Abecassis does not disclose providing that the server provides a browser interface for connection of the multimedia devices as recited, for example, in claim 7.

It was agreed that applicants' representative would review the pending claims to ensure that the claim language distinguishes the invention from a broadcast based on a general musical preference, and submit a formal response.

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claims 1-10, 12-14 and 16-18 were rejected based on U.S. Patent 6,192,340 to Abecassis. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested based on the amendments above and the following analysis.

As noted during the interview, Abecassis appears to disclose a system where a user can indicate a generalized information preference, whereupon a server will generate a playlist in accordance with that preference and broadcast clips in a stream to the user's multimedia device. Abecassis does not generate a playlist in his server in response to an interactive selection process performed by the user through the multimedia device.

Claim 1 is amended to recite that "one or more specific clips" are selected by "user interaction with a menu generated by the server", thus clearly distinguishing claim 1 from the disclosure of the Abecassis reference.

Claim 7 recites a method wherein one or more multimedia devices are connected to a selected media server via a browser interface. At least one of a plurality of stored multimedia clips are selected from a menu generated by the media server for rendering by the multimedia device. A playlist is generated in a standard Internet markup language at the media server, transmitted to at least one of the multimedia devices, and parsed. The clips are then rendered by retrieving the files defined in the playlist. These features are not disclosed or suggested in Abecassis.

Claim 8 is amended to recite that the media server generates a "menu of multimedia clips, receiving input of the user request for individual multimedia clips from the multimedia device, generating a playlist file, and providing the playlist file to the multimedia device". As noted above, these features are not disclosed or suggested in Abecassis.

Claim 14 is amended to recite that a media server generates a playlist file "in response to user interaction with a menu generated by the server wherein the user identifies particular clips to be played" and that a multimedia device is "operable to receive the playlist file from the media server and to parse the playlist file to obtain clips and play the specified playlist."

Claim 16 recites a multimedia device with means for displaying at least one networked media server with a plurality of stored clips, means for interactive text searching of the stored clips, means for requesting at least one of the stored clips from the server, and means for receiving a remotely generated playlist data file, generated by the server, comprised of data identifying the requested stored clip. The device further includes "means for parsing said remotely generated data file" and "means for displaying said remotely generated data file with local data." Any or all of these features clearly distinguish the invention recited in claim 16 from the disclosure of Abecassis.

Thus, each of the independent claims either recites features that are not disclosed or suggested in Abecassis, or has been amended to more clearly distinguish its features from those disclosed in Abecassis.

The assertions in the Official Action regarding the dependent claims are also respectfully traversed, but will not be addressed in detail since these claims are patentable based on the features recited in the base claims, as well as their individual distinguishing features that are novel in the recited context.

### ***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 11, 15, and 19-20 were rejected as unpatentable based on the combination of Abecassis and U.S. Patent 6,256,623 to Jones.

The pending independent claims (as amended) are patentable for at least the reasons noted above, and these claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency. It is also believed that these claims are independently patentable.

In preferred embodiments recited in dependent claims 11, 15, and 19, the playlist uses a markup language, for example, XML.

The cited Jones reference merely discloses the use of XML in an Internet environment. However, like the base Abecassis reference, Jones does not teach or suggest the generation of a playlist file in a media server and transmission of the playlist to a multimedia device using a markup language. Further, there is no suggestion in Jones that a playlist generated in a media server from user selections at a multimedia device, in particular, should be transmitted in a markup language, for example XML. Neither Jones nor Abecassis suggests this type of operation; they are similarly silent on how such an operation might be implemented.

Applicant has found that the use of a markup language as defined in the claims offers particular advantages in this context, for the particular purpose of transmitting a playlist to a multimedia device. There is no specific motivation in either of these references to generate and transmit a playlist in markup language format at a media server and transmit it to a multimedia device for use by that device in retrieving clips. Therefore, this combination of references does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness as to the rejected claims.

### ***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the

Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Evan R. Smith  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 35,683

Date: 4/6/05

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600